

Duval County Public Schools

Greenfield Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 10 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 21 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 21 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 24 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 26 |

Greenfield Elementary School

6343 KNIGHTS LN N, Jacksonville, FL 32216

<http://www.duvalschools.org/greenfield>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Greenfield's Mission is to create a positive and secure environment for learning in a diverse community where staff and students strive to meet their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenfield's Vision: A Community working together to meet the needs of ALL students.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------|---------------------|--|
| Gentry, Cindy | Principal | Principal duties and responsibilities include: *Oversight of the daily activities of the school with an emphasis on teaching, learning, safety, culture and climate. *Monitor and support high quality curriculum and instruction that ensures all students meet the expectations of Florida's BEST standards *Ensure the successful implementation of MTSS *Ensure the school's compliance with all Individual Education Plans of all students receiving ESE services *Recruit, retain, and develop high quality teachers and paraprofessionals *Ensure fiscal compliance |
| McGee, Bridget | Assistant Principal | The assistant principal supports and assists the principal in all of her duties, both instructional and operational. |

The duties and responsibilities of the reading coach include the following:

- *Provide support for all teachers in the implementation of Florida's BEST standards using the district-adopted curriculum materials.
- *Facilitate weekly common planning sessions for grade level teams
- *Facilitate literacy-focused professional learning communities
- *Provide individual coaching for teachers based on their needs to include modeled lessons, observation and feedback, co-teaching, lesson planning and design, and other professional activities
- *Design and deliver professional learning experiences for teachers in large and small group settings.
- *Collect, analyze, and plan using data

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

All stakeholders are invited to provide feedback on the needs of the school and strategies to address deficiencies. Stakeholders include faculty, staff, parents, and community members. Groups of faculty and staff members are gathered to review data and make recommendations as to strategies and actions that will improve student performance and school culture.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The School Improvement Plan will be shared with all stakeholders after approval and revisited throughout the school year during faculty meetings, common planning sessions, School Advisory Council meetings, and Parent Nights.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|--|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 81% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 91% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | 2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 10 | 64 | 44 | 43 | 21 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 212 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 34 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 21 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 2 | 74 | 61 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 197 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 39 | 35 | 31 | 24 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 2 | 35 | 46 | 31 | 20 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 34 | 62 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 35 | 58 | 51 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 2 | 35 | 46 | 31 | 20 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4 | 34 | 62 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 5 | 35 | 58 | 51 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 43 | 48 | 53 | 47 | 50 | 56 | 47 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 67 | | | 68 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58 | | | 60 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 62 | 58 | 59 | 55 | 48 | 50 | 55 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 48 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58 | | | 30 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 32 | 52 | 54 | 45 | 59 | 59 | 27 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 63 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 53 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 46 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 56 | 54 | 59 | 64 | | | 55 | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 46 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 231 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 57 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 456 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100 |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 36 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 59 | | | |
| BLK | 43 | | | |
| HSP | 35 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | 64 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 68 | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | 44 | | | |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 69 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 52 | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| MUL | 57 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 67 | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 43 | | | 62 | | | 32 | | | | | 56 |
| SWD | 38 | | | 47 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| ELL | 24 | | | 55 | | | 14 | | | | 5 | 56 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 59 | | | 81 | | | 36 | | | | 4 | |
| BLK | 47 | | | 65 | | | 31 | | | | 4 | |
| HSP | 27 | | | 50 | | | 23 | | | | 5 | 56 |
| MUL | 57 | | | 71 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | | | 68 | | | | | | | 3 | |
| FRL | 45 | | | 66 | | | 24 | | | | 5 | 57 |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 47 | 67 | 58 | 55 | 62 | 58 | 45 | | | | | 64 |
| SWD | 29 | 47 | | 44 | 70 | | 31 | | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 64 | 50 | 39 | 52 | 63 | 31 | | | | | 64 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 79 | | 75 | 50 | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 | ELP Progress |
| BLK | 45 | 66 | | 47 | 57 | | 38 | | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 63 | 48 | 48 | 61 | 63 | 32 | | | | | 63 |
| MUL | 53 | 50 | | 53 | 70 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 78 | | 70 | 74 | | 58 | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 68 | 62 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 42 | | | | | 71 |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 47 | 68 | 60 | 55 | 48 | 30 | 27 | | | | | 55 |
| SWD | 36 | 53 | | 45 | 47 | | 21 | | | | | |
| ELL | 38 | 72 | 64 | 51 | 48 | | 21 | | | | | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 72 | 82 | | 72 | 73 | | 36 | | | | | 40 |
| BLK | 46 | 47 | | 50 | 24 | | 17 | | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 74 | 70 | 52 | 54 | 30 | 13 | | | | | 58 |
| MUL | 29 | | | 47 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 81 | | 60 | 44 | | 43 | | | | | |
| FRL | 42 | 65 | 62 | 50 | 41 | 27 | 26 | | | | | 44 |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 47% | -18% | 54% | -25% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 47% | 50% | -3% | 58% | -11% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 32% | 46% | -14% | 50% | -18% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 49% | 59% | -10% | 59% | -10% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 67% | 58% | 9% | 61% | 6% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 52% | 3% | 55% | 0% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 28% | 48% | -20% | 51% | -23% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance which can be contributed to our students lack of science content knowledge, vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. In addition, students needed additional opportunities for hands on science learning to include aligned investigations, labs and subsequent lab reports.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science showed the greatest decline from the previous year and can be contributed to to our students lack of science content knowledge, vocabulary and reading comprehension skills. In addition, students needed additional opportunities for hands on science learning to include aligned investigations, labs and subsequent lab reports.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

State data unavailable

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Math data showed the most improvement and can be attributed to instruction which included many opportunities for students to gain conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem solving skills.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Two areas of concern include reading achievement, science achievement.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Reading achievement, reading achievement of the lowest performing students, and science achievement.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

56% of students in grades 3-5 were NOT proficient readers based on the 2023 FAST ELA Assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2023, 50% of students will perform at or above grade level on the Spring Administration of the FAST Spring Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring data for Waterford, I-Ready, and FAST PM1 and PM2 will be used to determine how students are progressing towards this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1. For K-2 students explicit, systematic instruction focused on phonemic awareness, letter instruction, and word recognition (coding and encoding) and frequent reading of connected text to build accuracy, automaticity, fluency and comprehension.
2. For 3-5 students, read alouds from a variety of complex texts to build knowledge and vocabulary, student discussions to develop academic vocabulary, and explicit vocabulary and grammar instruction embedded in authentic reading activities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategies selected are supported by the science of reading research and are appropriate for all students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. During a professional development session within the first month of school, review data with teachers and read and reflect upon the Science of Reading Defining Guide.
2. Train students on the new BEST standards in the first 30 days of school.
3. Structure the Reading Block to allow 120 minutes for reading daily.
4. Ensure daily instruction that includes read alouds from a variety of texts with an emphasis on

knowledge building and vocabulary.

5. Incorporate daily discussions in the classrooms to develop academic vocabulary.

7. Train new teachers on UFLI program to provide explicit instruction in phonics, letter instruction and word recognition.

8. Ensure daily opportunities for students to read connected texts to build accuracy, automaticity and accuracy.

9. Provide appropriate interventions for struggling readers (reading interventionist)

Person Responsible: Suzannah Williams (williamss24@duvalschools.org)

By When: Complete by May 2024.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By May 2023, 70% of 3-5 will score at or above grade level on the FAST Math Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Progress monitoring data will be used to determine how students are progressing towards this goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Bridget McGee (mcgeeb@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use the gradual release of responsibility model for instructional delivery with an emphasis on collaborative learning to provide productive struggle for students. Instruction will include a progression from physical manipulatives to visual representations and abstract symbols.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need more opportunities to solve problems using manipulatives and collaborative learning strategies while moving from concrete models to abstract symbols.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Provide all new teachers with a copy of and professional development on the BEST Standards and the Mathematical Reasoning Standards.
2. Ensure all K-2 teachers participate in instructional rounds where they observe high quality math instruction and identify effective instructional strategies to implement in their classrooms.
3. Ensure all K-2 teachers participate in collaborative planning for math to ensure deep understand of the benchmarks to be taught, aligned materials, and appropriate instructional strategies.
4. Engage teachers in data discussions after each progress monitoring assessment to drive instruction.
5. Hire a math coach support teacher growth and interventionist to ensure students who are not making adequate progress in computation and number sense.

Person Responsible: Bridget McGee (mcgeeb@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

To improve school culture we will focus on improving attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the year, we will reduce the number of students with less than 90% attendance by 10 percentage points.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

To monitor, we will use daily average attendance each week with a goal of having an average of 95% or higher.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To increase attendance, we will provide engaging instruction and activities that increase student interest in school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To improve student achievement they must attend school regularly.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

To improve attendance, we will need to make our school an inviting place for students and parents and provide high-quality engaging instruction. In addition we will need to increase outreach to families to connect them with community resources that will decrease barriers to school attendance.

Person Responsible: Cindy Gentry (gentryc@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2023

Monitor student attendance and follow up with families of students with poor attendance.

Person Responsible: Bridget McGee (mcgeeb@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Provide multiple opportunities for engagement including clubs and activities (student council, honor society, safety patrols, poetry club)

Person Responsible: Suzannah Williams (williamss24@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

For K-2 students, explicit, systematic instruction focused on phonemic awareness, letter instruction, and word recognition (coding and encoding) and frequent reading of connected text to build accuracy, automaticity, and fluency comprehension. In addition, students will participate in frequent read alouds of complex text, both literary and informational, with discussion to build oral language and vocabulary.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

For 3-5 students, read alouds from a variety of complex texts to build knowledge and vocabulary, student discussions to develop academic vocabulary, and explicit vocabulary and grammar instruction embedded in authentic reading activities.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, 50% or more of students in grades K-2 will perform at or above grade level on the FAST PM3 Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By May 2024, 50% or more of students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 3 or above on the FAST PM3 Assessment.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

To monitor student progress towards end of year goals, the following will occur:

1. K-2 students will complete weekly progress monitoring assessments using the UFLI Foundations Program.
2. Three times per year, students will be assessed using the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy assessment.
3. Kindergarten students will take the Waterford Reading Assessment twice per year.
4. First and second grade students will complete the I-Ready Diagnostic Assessment twice per year.
5. After each assessment, teachers along with coaches and administration, will review data and revise instructional and intervention plans to address student performance.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gentry, Cindy, gentryc@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

UFLI Foundations will be utilized in grades K-2 and will include the following evidence-based practices: explicit instruction, deliberate/interleaved practice, and spelling instruction. Benchmark Advance will be implemented in grades 3-5 and will include the following evidence-based practices: explicit vocabulary instruction, read alouds with classroom discussion to build knowledge, and explicit strategy instruction to include self monitoring, creating mental images, answering and asking questions, summarizing, and inferring. Schoolwide practices will include goal-setting, teacher feedback, thinking maps, interactive journals, centers, and a dedicated intervention block in grades 2-5.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Systematic phonics and phonemic awareness instruction has been proven to increase students' ability to decode and encode words. Reading connected text with targeted phonics concepts/skills has been shown to increase reading fluency, automaticity, and comprehension. Explicit vocabulary instruction, building background knowledge, and classroom discussions has been proven to increase reading comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|--|
| The literacy leadership team will meet regularly to review progress monitoring data and plan professional learning experiences for teachers. | Gentry, Cindy, gentryc@duvalschools.org |
| Literacy Coaching: Provide individual coaching for teachers based on classroom observation of evidence-based practices and programs. Provide feedback to teachers and classroom support in the form of co-teaching, observation of the teacher and feedback, and instructional rounds. | Gentry, Cindy, gentryc@duvalschools.org |
| Assessment: Administer progress monitoring assessments (state, district, and school), review data, after each assessment, group students for small group instruction/ intervention/enrichment based on data. | McGee, Bridget, mcgeeb@duvalschools.org |
| Professional Learning: Teachers will participate in implementation training for UFLI and weekly common planning/PLCs. Sessions will be followed by classroom support from the instructional coach and/or administrator. | Gentry, Cindy, gentryc@duvalschools.org |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
 List the school’s webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP plan will be shared with parents during Parent Nights and Open House. A one page summarization of data and plan goals will be shared in multiple languages.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school’s mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child’s progress.
 List the school’s webpage* where the school’s Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

To build positive relationships with families, the school will utilize an open school policy for parents by inviting them to special events at various times. Teachers will be available to confer with parents to share how students are performing. We will use the Bloomz app to communicate with parents to increase engagement.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

The school will implement bell to bell instruction with a focus on reading, math and science. Teachers will use evidence based practices using science of reading research.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

The school will integrate Federal Programs include the School Lunch Program and McKinney Vento.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

The school ensures counseling by referring students in need of additional support to Full Service Schools and provides space and time for students to receive counseling during the school day. All teachers are trained in the procedures for referring students, Youth Mental Health First Aid, and ALERT.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

The school will utilize the MTSS model to address academic and behavior difficulties. The Collaborative Problem Solving Team will meet bi-weekly to discuss students of interest, design and monitor interventions.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Teachers will participate in monthly professional learning that address the science of learning and reading. Participating teachers will share their learning with colleagues and administrators will monitor and support implementation of learned strategies.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The school will provide opportunities for pre-school students to participate in activities in the kindergarten classroom. Information will be shared with parents on the process of enrolling for kindergarten and the behavior/academic expectations for kindergarten.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|---|---------------|
| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes